

REMARKS

The Office Action of 07/03/2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-7 were rejected as being anticipated by Kemmochi. Claim 2 was rejected as being unpatentable over Kemmochi in view of Ella. Claims 4 and 9 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kemmochi in view of Hikita. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited references. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, the claims have been amended to recite that the phase shifting circuits of the branching circuit are impedance transforming from a lower impedance to a higher impedance.

With respect to the impedance transforming feature, the rejection states in part:

[Note that] the phase shifting circuit LD4 as shown in Figs. 4, 25, 26 and 34 is impedance transforming (i.e., see Fig. 7 and paragraphs 0086-0089).

However, Fig. 7 of Kemmochi does not pertain to the phase shifting circuit per se. Rather Fig. 7 pertains to an equivalent circuit including a portion of the switch SW of Figure 2, the phase shift circuit LD4, the filter f2 and a load ZL. There is no clear teaching in Kemmochi that the phase shifting circuit itself is impedance transforming, especially no clear teaching that the phase shifting circuits are impedance transforming from a lower impedance to a higher impedance as presently claimed.

What Kemmochi does clearly teach is that the SAW filter f2 is impedance transforming (paragraph 0091). This is a measure to be avoided in accordance with the teachings of the present specification.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Ure/
Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 7/25/2008